

07C-4059-64
COPY 1 OF 1

25X1A

October 16, 1962

Dear Milt:

I am very pleased, although I was not aware of it, that Frank has taken the trouble to check out our processing at [redacted] 25X1. I am even more gratified that, without any warning or preparation, the results were so good. The results we achieved, since they can be considered no better than run-of-the-mill, are certainly very good and demonstrate that my people are not falling down on their job.

Frank posed three requirements. They are probably easiest answered in reverse.

Item 3. There is certainly no problem in providing sensitometric data. We accumulate this as a matter of course and it is no problem to make you a copy at the time. If you prefer to do your own reading, just let us know and we will run two concurrent strips - one for you and one for our records.

Item 2. I don't doubt that, since you were one of the first to obtain S0-132, you found some variation in speed. This, of course, will gradually become closer and closer to a specific figure as we accumulate more experience with the manufacture of this emulsion. But there are factors other than manufacturing such as age, ambient, etc., that contribute to these slight variations in emulsion speed. The actual exposure is further influenced by a number of factors beyond your or my control. We could furnish this information but would it be of any use to you except as a theoretical tool?

Item 1. Again, as we have said before, Frank is to be congratulated on the X-80 formula which he devised. However, as we also have said before, it is not a developer which is compatible with our machines, either here or at [redacted]. While D-19 is not the optimum developer with respect to image quality for Type 4404 film, it does lend itself well as being a versatile developer which is one of the essential requirements in [redacted]. In our shop we do use another formula for Type 4404 film which does improve the image quality and modulation transfer function. Therefore, we believe that our shop process provides for the advantages of your X-80 developer plus being compatible with our equipment. In the final analysis, as I am sure you appreciate, the results obtainable are a combined function of lens-film-vehicle-processing-reproduction performance.

-2-

25X1A

Processors have certain restrictions placed on them. They must be capable of processing long lengths of film in relatively short periods of time. In addition, a processor at [redacted] has three added restrictions - it must be simple, it must not occupy much space, and it must not require much manpower.

We, therefore, selected a small commercial machine modified it to give reasonable quality and tested it to insure that we could cross-correlate its performance with that of our machines here at home. It was never intended to be any more than a piece of field test equipment. In the process we are not aware that we have done anything to degrade the practical performance of any equipment with which it might be associated. However, if you can definitely demonstrate that we are the cause of poor results from your camera, I certainly will make every effort to help you convince the customer that something should be done to improve the situation.

Regards,

ELG/MDG

E. L. G.

cc: E.L.T. ✓

Memo For Record

Probably the first of a series to prove we are responsible for poor performance. Let's do as much as we can to help them within practical limits but stop there.

E. L. G.